



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,474	07/11/2001	Norman Wesley Gimbert	13DV-14215	9339

7590 09/10/2003

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2175

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PRL

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/903,474	GIMBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neveen Abel-Jalil	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____ 5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

DETAILED ACTION

1. The request for reconsideration filed on July 2, 2003 has been received and entered.

After careful reconsideration, a new rejection is presented as follows:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 6, 7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karaev et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,518).

As to claims 6, and 13, Karaev et al. discloses a web-based communications system (See abstract) comprising:

a computer comprising a browser; a network coupled to said computer (See column 7, lines 24-64);

a first server system comprising a first web server and a first database (See column 10, lines 44-67, also see figure 1), said first web server coupled to said first database and to said network (See column 7, lines 23-31), said first web server configured to cause to be displayed at said computer at least one web page populated with data from said first database (See column 3, lines 60-67, also see column 5, lines 39-54); and

a second server system comprising a second web server and a second database (See column 3, lines 12-20, also see figure 5, shows more than one sever coupled to more than one database), said second web server coupled to said second database and to said network (See column 38, lines 45-67), said second web server configured to cause to be displayed at said computer at least one web page populated with data from said second database (See column 13, lines 46-64), data stored in said first server system database selectively accessible to said browser via said second server system (See column 14, lines 6-15, also see column 50-67).

As to claim 7, Karaev et al. discloses wherein said data stored in said first server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser (See column 7, lines 24-67) based on based on individual access privileges (See Karaev et al. column 9, lines 22-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-4, 8, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaev et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,518) in view of Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,479).

As to claim 1, Karaev et al. discloses a method for communicating information using a system including a first server system and a second server system (See figure 1, 11, DB server,

13, DB server), the first server system including a first web server and a first database, the second server system including a second web server and a second database (See column 4, lines 17-32), said method comprising the steps of:

coupling the first web server to the first database (See column 3, lines 12-20);
accessing at least one web page populated with data from the first database via a computer including a browser (See column 3, lines 60-67, also see column 5, lines 39-54);
coupling the second web server to the second database (See column 3, lines 12-20);
accessing at least one web page populated with data from the second database via the computer browser (See column 7, lines 24-65, and column 8, lines 1-10, wherein "second database" reads on "repository server"); and
selectively accessing data stored in the first server system database via the second server system (See column 9, lines 64-67, and column 10, lines 1-18, wherein "selectively" reads on "sent to the appropriate database").

Karaev et al. does not teach aircraft and aircraft engine information.

Nelson teaches aircraft and aircraft engine information (See column 1, lines 12-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. to include aircraft and aircraft engine information.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. by the teaching of Glass et al. to include aircraft and aircraft engine information because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows

for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 2, Karaev et al. as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the first web server to the first database (See column 3, lines 12-20) further comprises the step of providing a first server system hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See Nelson column 1, lines 16-23, also see Nelson column 2, lines 27-49).

As to claim 3, Karaev et al. as modified discloses wherein said step of coupling the second web server to the second database (See column 3, lines 12-20, also see figure 5, shows more than one sever coupled to more than one database) further comprises the step of providing a second server system hosted by an aircraft manufacturer (See Nelson column 4, lines 12-37, wherein "second database" reads on "intranet", also see Nelson column 1, lines 16-29).

As to claim 4, Karaev et al. as modified discloses wherein said step of selectively accessing data stored in the first server system (See column 9, lines 64-67, and see column 10, lines 1-18) further comprises the step of selectively accessing data from the first and second server systems based on individual access privileges (See Nelson figure 9, 404, shows "access privileges" represented by "log-on", also see Karaev et al. column 9, lines 22-42).

As to claims 8, and 14, Karaev et al. discloses said first server system and second server system (See column 4, lines 15-49).

Karaev et al. does not teach wherein said server system is hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer, said server system hosted by a business partner of the turbine engine manufacturer.

Nelson teaches wherein said server system (See Nelson column 2, lines 42-49) hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer (See Nelson column 1, lines 12-15), said server system hosted by a business partner of the turbine engine manufacturer (See Nelson column 1, lines 52-58, wherein “business partner” reads on “customer”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. to include wherein said server system is hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer, said server system hosted by a business partner of the turbine engine manufacturer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein said server system is hosted by a turbine engine manufacturer, said server system hosted by a business partner of the turbine engine manufacturer because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

As to claim 15, Karaev et al. as modified discloses wherein said data stored in said first server system and said second server system accessible to the user browser (See column 7, lines 24-67) based on individual access privileges (See Nelson column 3, lines 59-67, and Nelson column 4, lines 1-7, also see Karaev et al. column 9, lines 22-42).

6. Claims 5, 9-10, 12, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaev et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,518) in view of Nelson (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,479) as applied to claims 1-4, 8, 14-15 above, and further in view of Glass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965).

As to claim 5, Karaev et al. as modified discloses wherein said step of selectively accessing data stored in the first server system (See column 10, lines 1-43) further comprises the step of selectively accessing at least one of aircraft engine and aircraft data relating to at least one of general information data (See Nelson column 7, lines 64-67), propulsion systems data (See Nelson figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering data (See Nelson figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Karaev et al. as modified still does not teach plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. teaches plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to

include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claims 9, and 10, Karaev et al. discloses wherein at least one of said first database and said second database includes data (See column 6, lines 57-67).

Karaev et al. does not teach aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data.

Nelson teaches aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data (See Nelson column 7, lines 64-67), propulsion systems data (See Nelson figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering data (See Nelson figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. to include aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. by the teaching of Nelson to include aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data, propulsion systems data, and engineering data because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

Karaev et al. as modified still does not teach plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. teaches plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 12, Karaev et al. discloses a database structure configured to be protected from access by unauthorized individuals (See column 3, lines 58-67, and column 4, lines 1-5), said database structure comprising a first database and a second database (See column 6, lines 57-67), said first database coupled to a first server system, said second database coupled to a second server system (See column 4, lines 17-42), at least one of said first database and said second database including information relating to at least one of general information (See column 6, lines 21-56, wherein "general information" reads on reports...for example, news reports...product reviews"), said first database linked to a first web page configured to be populated with data from said first database (See column 13, lines 52-67), said second database linked to a second web page configured to be populated from said second database (See column 7, lines 24-67).

Karaev et al. does not teach hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; propulsion systems, and engineering.

Nelson teaches hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer (See column 1, lines 16-30); hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer (See column 1, lines 52-58, wherein “business partner” reads on “customer”); propulsion systems (See figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering (See figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; propulsion systems, and engineering.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. by the teaching of Nelson to include hosted by an aircraft engine manufacturer; hosted by a business partner of the aircraft engine manufacturer; propulsion systems, and engineering because providing specific records dealing with one industry allows for efficiency and effective tracking of information thereby reducing business costs associated with the aircraft industry.

Karaev et al. as modified still does not teach plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. teach plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claims 16, and 18, Karaev et al. as modified discloses wherein said browser (See column 3, lines 60-67, also see column 5, lines 39-54) configured to selectively display aircraft engine data relating to at least one of general information data (See Nelson column 7, lines 64-67), propulsion systems data (See Nelson figure 3, shows “propulsion systems data” represented by “Part Name” listing), and engineering data (See Nelson figure 3, shows “engineering data” represented by “Tech Publications”).

Karaev et al. as modified still does not teach plans and schedules data.

Glass et al. teaches plans (See column 7, lines 6-14) and schedules data (See column 3, lines 32-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified to include plans and schedules data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to

include plans and schedules data because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

As to claim 17, Karaev et al. as modified still does not teach wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface.

Glass et al. teaches wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log (See column 5, lines 41-48) relating to navigational changes (See column 5, lines 34-51, wherein “maintains a record” reads on “flight history”, also see column 22, lines 38-63, wherein “navigational changes” reads on “flight plans”) to said user interface (See column 11, lines 12-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified to include wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Karaev et al. as modified by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein said browser configured to selectively display an historical log relating to navigational changes to said user interface because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

Art Unit: 2175

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaev et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,518) in view of Glass et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,278,965).

As to claim 11, Karaev et al. discloses said first database and said second database (See column 6, lines 57-67).

Karaev et al. does not teach wherein at least one of said database maintains a record of navigation changes.

Glass et al. teaches wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes (See column 5, lines 34-51, wherein "maintains a record" reads on "flight history", also see column 22, lines 38-63, wherein "navigational changes" reads on "flight plans").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Karaev et al. by the teaching of Glass et al. to include wherein at least one of said first database and said second database maintains a record of navigation changes because the partnership will reduce business costs by introducing efficient information retrieval and processing.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2175

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Mahoney et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,819,271) teaches corporate information communication and delivery system and method including entitable hypertext links.

Kitain et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,871) teaches information delivery system and method including online entitlements.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 703-305-8114.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4: 30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on 703-305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Neveen Abel-Jalil



SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER